2009 Oct-27 PM 03:09 U.S. DISTRICT COURT N.D. OF ALABAMA

EXHIBIT 6

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, Case 2:07-cv-01928-Reburre an bile of 10/27/09 Page 2 of 5

CENTRAL

MINUTE ORDER

Date: 07/08/2009

Time: 11:00:00 AM

Dept: C-70

Judicial Officer Presiding: Judge Jay M. Bloom

Clerk: Lynn Rockwell

Bailiff/Court Attendant: ERM: Not Reported

Case Init. Date: 07/24/2007

Case No: 37-2007-00071725-CU-BT-CTL Case Title: Edleson vs. American Home Shield of California,

Inc

Case Category: Civil - Unlimited Case Type: Business Tort

Event Type: Motion Hearing (Civil)

Causal Document & Date Filed:

Appearances:

The Court, having taken the above-entitled matter under submission on 07/02/2009 and having fully considered the arguments of all parties, both written and oral, as well as the evidence presented, now rules as follows:

THE MOTION FOR FINAL APPROVAL OF THE CLASS ACTION SETTLMENT IS DENIED. ALL EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS ARE OVERRULED.

The motion for final approval of the class action settlement is denied. While the court respects the views of Justice Wiener and learned counsel in this case, the court cannot justify approval of the settlement. Plaintiffs, other than the two lead plaintiffs, really get nothing more than a right to submit or resubmit claims to a defendant that has allegedly not acted in good faith on prior occasions. There are no guarantees claims will now be accepted or properly serviced, or that if improperly denied, plaintiffs have any realistic remedy. They may have the right to sue in the future, but that is subject to the applicable statute of limitations in each jurisdiction in the United States. The court has no information as to what the applicable limitations are or what other limits may exist to preclude filing of a lawsuit.

The settlement also allows defendant to essentially sell more insurance to plaintiffs at an unspecified price. This allows defendant to make additional money from the settlement rather than paying it out to plaintiffs. The contractor relations initiative also does not provide plaintiffs with any realistic guarantees. The entire settlement essentially asks plaintiffs to give up many viable and realistic rights in return for the hope that defendant will act in good faith. Without more concrete guarantees, plaintiffs, other than the lead plaintiffs, have gotten very little in return for a waiver of claims against defendant. In the face of this illusory result for plaintiffs, counsel receive \$2.75 million and defendants substantially limit their liability for past conduct. The court cannot accept this result. Any settlement must give the plaintiff class some tangible benefits or an unfettered right to bring legal claims against defendant.

Plaintiffs' MOTION FOR AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES AND EXPENSES is DENIED.

Date: 07/08/2009

Dept: C-70

MINUTE ORDER

Page: I

Calendar No.: 14

It is so ordered.

Yay M. Bloom

Date: 07/08/2009

Dept: C-70

Calendar No.: 14

Case 2:07-cv-01928-RDP Document	:39-6 Fik	ed 10/27/09 Page 4 of 5	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN D	IEGO		
Central 330 West Broadway San Diego, CA 92101			
SHORT TITLE: Edleson vs. American Home Shield of Californi	a, Inc		
CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE BY MAIL		CASE NUMBER:	
		37-2007-00071725-CU-BT-CTL	
I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that a trucourt practices in a sealed envelope with postage fully prethis certification occurred at San Diego, California, on 07/09	paid, address	e attached was mailed following sta sed as indicated below. The mailin	indard ng and
	10 N. S.	a mingraphing mangament a school 1 fich	
Clerk of the Court, by:	Y. Kreb L. Rock	vell well	_ , Deputy
Edward Chapin 550 WEST C STREET, SUITE 2000 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101	Robert R. G Kirkland & El 655 15th Str Washington,	lis, LLP reet	
Robert M. Stone Sidley Austin LLP 555 W 5th St Los Angeles, CA 90013	Francis A Bo Johnson Bot 655 West Bo San Diego, C	tini LLP roadway # 1400	
DAVID J NOONAN Kirby Noonan Lance & Hoge LLP 350 Tenth Avenue, Suite 1300 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101		Tulie M. Weber Austin LLP	woehner
	المحالمة والمحادث	outh Dearborn St.	
Richard L. Stone		age IL 60603	
Hogan & Hartson LLP 1999 Avenue of the Stars Ste 1400	0	0 332.3	
		·	
Los Angeles CA 90067			
Additional names and address attached.			

Case 2:07-cv-01928-RDP	Document 39-6 Filed 10/27/09 Page 5 01 5
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY (COUNTY COURTHOUSE, 220 W. BROADWAY, SAN DIEGO, CA HALL OF JUSTICE, 330 W. BROADWAY, SAN DIEGO, CA FAMILY COURT, 1555 6TH AVE, SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-3 MADGE BRADLEY BLDG., 1409 4TH AVE., SAN DIEGO, C KEARNY MESA BRANCH, 8950 CLAIREMONT MESA BLV NORTH COUNTY DIVISION, 325 S. MELROSE DR., VISTA EAST COUNTY DIVISION, 250 E. MAIN ST., EL CAJON, CA RAMONA BRANCH, 1428 MONTECITO RD., RAMONA, CA SOUTH COUNTY DIVISION, 500 3RD AVE., CHULA VISTA JUVENILE COURT, 2851 MEADOW LARK DR., SAN DIEG	GO, CA 92101-3814 92101-3827 1294 CA 92101-3105 D., SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1187 A, CA 92083-6643 A 92020-3941 A 92065-5200 A, CA 91910-5649 O, CA 92123-2792 B3-6634
PLAINTIFF(S)/PETITIONER(S)	By: L. ROCKWELL, Deputy
EDLESON	
DEFENDANT(S)/RESPONDENT(S)	JUDGE: Jay M. Bloom
AMERICAN HOME SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA, INC.	et al
	DEPT: 70 CASE NUMBER
CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF SERVI (CCP 1013a(4))	CE BY MAIL 2007-71725
en the parties shown below by placing a true copy in a separation of the parties shown below by placing a true copy in a separation postage thereon fully prepaid, deposited in the United Chula Vista Ramona, California.	rate envelope, addressed as shown below; each envelope was then sealed and.
NAME & ADDRESS	NAME & ADDRESS
Jeffrey L. Weinstein, Esq. Jeffrey L. Weinstein, P.C. 518 East Tyler Street Athens, Texas 75751	Daniel Brown, Esq. Law Offices of Daniel Brown 131 Lawnview Circle Danville, California 94526-5107
Katherine Winn, Esq. Law Office of KatherineWinn 2635 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 110 San Diego, California 92108	J. Garrett Kendrick, Esq. C. Benjamin Nutley, Esq. Kendrick & Nutley 1055 E. Colorado Blvd., 5 th Floor Pasadena, CA 91106
John W. Davis, LAW OFFICE OF JOHN W. DAVIS 501 W. Broadway, Suite 800 San Diego, CA 92101	
	CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
Date: <u>July 8, 2009</u> by	A Rockwell, Deputy
	I Rockwell